

RECEIVED

NOV 18 2005

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Merrill D. Gurney**

2005 NOV -8 P 3: 09

2037 West Lindsay Drive , Taylorsville, Utah 84119-5403

November 01, 2005 02:36 PM

Representative Chris Cannon  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2436 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Representative Cannon:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

cc: FCC Chair Kevin Martin, Congress

Sincerely,

Merrill D. Gurney

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Merrill D. Gurney". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the printed name.

cc:

The Federal Communications Commission not

**Merrill D. Gurney**

---

2037 West Lindsay Drive , Taylorsville, Utah 84119-5403

November 01, 2005 02:36 PM

Senator Robert Bennett  
U.S. Senate  
431 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Senator Bennett:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

cc: FCC Chair Kevin Martin, Congress

Sincerely,

Merrill D. Gurney

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Merrill D. Gurney". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "M".

cc:

The Federal Communications Commission not

**Merrill D. Gurney**

---

2037 West Lindsay Drive , Taylorsville, Utah 84119-5403

November 01, 2005 02:36 PM

Senator Orrin Hatch  
U.S. Senate  
104 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Senator Hatch:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.


Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

cc: FCC Chair Kevin Martin, Congress

Sincerely,

Merrill D. Gurney

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Merrill D. Gurney". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the printed name.

cc:

The Federal Communications Commission not

**Linda Thorman**

1602 Lyndhurst Drive Apt. #C, Savoy, Illinois 61874-8702

**RECEIVED**

November 02, 2005

Senator Dick Durbin  
U.S. Senate  
332 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510-0001

NOV 18 2005

2005 NOV -8 P 3: 09

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Senator Durbin:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,



No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

cc: K. Martin

**Linda Thorman**

1602 Lyndhurst Drive Apt. #C, Savoy, Illinois 61874-8702

November 02, 2005

Representative Timothy Johnson  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1229 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Representative Johnson:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.


A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

  
cc. K. Martin



**Linda Thorman**

1602 Lyndhurst Drive Apt. #C, Savoy, Illinois 61874-8702

November 02, 2005

Senator Barack Obama  
U.S. Senate  
713 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Senator Obama:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.


A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

  
cc: K. Martin

RECEIVED

NOV 18 2005

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Phyllis McCulley**

2932 Bomar Ave. , Fort Worth, Texas-76103

November 04, 2005

Senator Kay Hutchison  
U.S. Senate  
284 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Senator Hutchison:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers tax, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Phyllis McCulley  
Fort Worth, TX

cc: FCC Chair Kevin Martin, Congress

FCC General Email Box

**THOMAS L. TALBOT**

17 Artist Lake Boulevard • Middle Island, New York • 11953-1312

2005 NOV -8 P 3: 08

**RECEIVED**

November 2, 2005

NOV 18 2005

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chairman Kevin J Martin  
445 12th St. SW  
Washington, DC, 20554

Subject: RE: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service — Docket 96-45


Dear Chairman Martin,

I urge you to support the "Fair Share Plan" as a solution to current concerns with the Universal Service Fund (USF). The Fair Share Plan will keep the USF fair, ensuring that consumers like me do not pay the same rate into the USF as big businesses, regardless of how little I may use long distance. The Keep USF Fair Coalition submitted the Fair Share Plan to the FCC on January 31, 2005. It expands who pays into the USF so that other technologies—not just phones—pay into the system. The Fair Share Plan collects the USF using a combination numbers- and revenue-based plan. This keeps the system fair, equitable and non-discriminatory.

Under the flat fee or numbers-based plan you are considering, people like me who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. I believe it would be unfair to charge low-volume and residential customers the same fees as high-volume residential or business customers.

I urge you to keep the USF fair, and adopt the Fair Share Plan. Thank you.

Sincerely,



No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

RECEIVED

NOV 18 2005

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

LOREN A JOHNSON  
26883 BUCCANEER DR.  
SUN CITY, CA 92585

2005 NOV 14 P 3: 36

FCC, Chairman Kevin J Martin,  
445 12th St SW,  
Washington, DC, 20554.

Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.


A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,



cc: Barbara Boxer, Diane Feinstein, Darryl Issa

12.07.05 rec'd  
List A B C D E